



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/575,192	05/23/2000	Kia Silverbrook	NPA048US	9205

24011 7590 07/05/2005

SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD
393 DARLING STREET
BALMAIN, 2041
AUSTRALIA

EXAMINER

GRANT II, JEROME

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/575,192	Applicant(s) SILVERBROOK ET AL.	
	Examiner Jerome Grant II	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.


JEROME GRANT II
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Detailed Action

1. Claims 9, 11-13, 22-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 USC 112 5th paragraph. The paragraph states: A claim in multiple dependent form shall contain a reference, in the alternative only, to more than one claim previously set forth and then specify a further limitation of the subject matter claimed. A multiple dependent claim shall not serve as a basis for any other multiple dependent claim. A multiple dependent claim shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the particular claim in relation to which it is being considered. Claim 28 is improper for the reasons given above. Correction is required.

Art Unit: 2626

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-12, 14-17 and 19-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lemelson.

With respect to claims 1 and 14 Lemelson teaches a method of providing a copy of at least one page of a printed document having visible information, such as words or phrases and other printed indicia, according to col. 3, lines 17-22, the document including coded data (25) indicative of the identity of the document (21) and of at least one reference point of the document (right margin), the coded data, referred to from col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 5 supports the claimed limitation. Lemelson teaches the method including the steps of: receiving, in a computer system, (39N or 30) indicating data from a sensing device 39A, 39C - by a user (col. 5, lines 60-65) indicating the position of the sensing device relative to the document ; retrieving (via a user operating the computer system) from the computer system 39N or 30 a description of at least a page document (requesting a copy of a page of the document, see col. 6, lines 5-10) identifying the computer system (col. 5, lines 50-60) and a request for a copy of a

Art Unit: 2626

page of a document (col. 6, lines 5-10); and transmitting, from the system relevant document data to at least a printer for effecting a print (col. 9, lines 42-51).

With respect to claims 2 and 15, Lemelson teaches a zone of a document (right margin) having information associated with the copy of a page and used to identify the zone where a sensing device is located. See figures 3 and 5.

With respect to claim 3, Lemelson teaches the receiving step as claimed in accordance with step 74 and 77 of figure 10. See also col. 4, lines 10-17. Lemelson teaches identification a request for copy in the zone. See sensing of magnetic information on sheet. See col. 4, lines 22-27 and 37-42.

With respect to claim 4, Lemelson shows method using a printed document 21 with line coded data 25 indicative of a request including the steps of: receiving, a sensing device (39A, 39C) operated by a user (col. 5, lines 60-65) so that the document is positioned relative to the sensors (col. 4, lines 5--27); and transmitting relevant document data to effect printing, see col. 9, lines 42-51. 14.

Lemelson teaches a method of providing a copy of at least one page of a printed document having visible information, such as words or phrases and other printed indicia, according to col. 3, lines 17-22, the document including coded data (25) indicative of the identity of the document (21) and of at least one reference point of the

Art Unit: 2626

document (right margin), the coded data, referred to from col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 5 supports the claimed limitation.

With respect to claim 5, Lemelson shows providing a copy of a page 21 with coded data 25 including the steps of receiving in a computer system a sensing device (39a, 39c) operated by a user (col. 5, lines 60-65) so that the documents move relative to the sensing device (col. 4, lines 5-27); interpreting a movement of a sensing device as designating the request (via microprocessor 30 or computer 39N); and transmitting relevant document data to at least one printer (see col. 9, lines 42-51).

14 Lemelson teaches a method of providing a copy of at least one page of a printed document having visible information, such as words or phrases and other printed indicia, according to col. 3, lines 17-22, the document including coded data (25) indicative of the identity of the document (21) and of at least one reference point of the document (right margin), the coded data, referred to from col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 5 supports the claimed limitation.

With respect to claim 6, Lemelson teaches a method of copying at least one document 21 including coded data 25, the method including: receiving in a computer system (39N or 30) data from a sensing device 39A, 39C regarding IID of a user (user of printer having predetermined ID according to col. 4, lines 45-52), this information containing the

Art Unit: 2626

ID of the user and the sensor of the computing device which identifies a document having the coded data 25; identifying document (Col 5, lines 50-60 and col. 6, lines 5-10) and transmitting relevant document data to a printer (see col. 9, lines 42-51). Print request data is addressed at col. 6, lines 6-14, see also col. 9, lines 40-50.

14 Lemelson teaches a method of providing a copy of at least one page of a printed document having visible information, such as words or phrases and other printed indicia, according to col. 3, lines 17-22, the document including coded data (25) indicative of the identity of the document (21) and of at least one reference point of the document (right margin), the coded data, referred to from col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 5 supports the claimed limitation.

With respect to claim 7, the coded data appears in the margin of document 21 as data 25. Sensing device 39A and 39C reads the coded data.

With respect to claim 8, see col. 4, lines :5-27.

With respect to claim 9, see col. 9, lines 42-51.

With respect to claim 10, data exists on the magnetic strip. The data on the strip is invisible since it is digitally represented.

Art Unit: 2626

With respect to claim 11, the identification means is the microprocessor in accordance with col. 7, lines 9-15) which gives a unique identity of a user see also col. 4, lines 45-52.

With respect to claim 12, see col. 9, lines 40-50.

With respect to claim 16, see step 74 and 77 and fig. 10 of Lemelson. See also col. 4, lines 9-27.

With respect to claim 17, Lemelson teaches a computer system 39N or 30 for receiving data from sensors 39A or 39C by a user (col. 5, lines 50-60); the sensor sensing coded data 25 and the system making printed copies (see col. 9, lines 42-51)

With respect to claim 19, Lemelson teaches a system for printing documents 21 including coded data 25, the system including: a computer system 39N or 30 for sensing data (39A or 39C) regarding the identity of a user (see col. 5, lines 50-60) as the document is moved relative to the sensor. Lemelson teaches sensing data in the magnetic strip portion of 25; the computer system being configured to transmit relevant document using the coded data document data being sent to a printer as discussed at col. 4, lines 22-27 and 37-42.

With respect to claim 20, see col. 4, lines 20-27.

With respect to claim 21, see the sensing, devices 39A and 39C.

Art Unit: 2626

With respect to claim 22, Lemelson teaches the sensing device 39A and 39C recognizes marks on a magnetic nib.

With respect to claim 23, Lemelson teaches unique identity information for a user according to col. 3, line 60- col. 4, line 5. See also col. 4, lines 45-52.

With respect to claims 24-26 ,see col. 2, lines 10-15; col. 5, lines 52-55 and col. 9, lines 41-48.

With respect to claim 27, see the digital data recorded on the magnetic strip.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13, 18, 21, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemelson in view of the Well Known Prior Art 2144.03.

Regarding claims 13 and 28, Lemelson teaches all of the limitations upon which the claim depends except for binding the pages.

However, this limitation is obvious in view of printers which are well known to have a staple means. In other words, the printer makes the prints of a plurality of sheets and binds them by means of a stapler. This is a common feature with printer and copiers and would have been recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claim 18 and 21, Lemelson teaches all of the subject matter upon which the claim depends except for moving the sensing device relative to the document. See also col. 4, lines 2227 and 37-42.

Lemelson shows moving the document relative to the sensing means. Moving the sensing means relative to a document is well known in the art. Such is the case with bar code type readers, for example.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace or modify the scanner of Lemelson so that the sensor is moved relative to the document such as performed by references well known in the art, i.e., bar codes and other optical readers.

Examiner's Remarks

Applicant's remarks have been considered but are unpersuasive to allow the claims.

At page 10 of the Remarks, applicant states that certain claims under Sect. 102 where objected to. To the contrary these claims have been rejected. Applicant argues that Lemelson does not provide a copy of a printed document.

A copy of a printed document 21 is displayed on display means 14. The copy has visible printed indicia for observation by the user of the device.

Applicant argues that Lemelson does not describe providing a copy of a page of a printed document. Applicant acknowledges that this is not explicitly stated in the claim, but is inherent. The examiner submits that Lemelson goes beyond what is inherent, but specifically teaches the claimed limitation.

Hence Lemelson is applicable against the claims.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Grant II whose telephone number is 571-272-7463. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams, can be reached on 571-272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 305-3900.

J. Grant II

JEROME GRANT II
PRIMARY EXAMINER

